REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested. Specifically, favorable consideration of pending Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9-12, and 14-40 is respectfully requested.

THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C.§112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 21 and 22 are currently amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. In particular, by the current amendments, all features recited within Claims 21 and 22 are provided with proper antecedent basis and, therefore, any alleged indefiniteness has been eliminated.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the present rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C.§103(a)

The following rejections have been made of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

I.   Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9-12, and 14-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joy (U.S. Patent 5,761,670; hereafter "Joy"); and

II.   Claims 29-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joy in view of Lundin *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,339,430; hereafter "Lundin").

The Applicant respectfully traverses both of rejections I and II, primarily upon the assertion that Joy is fundamentally deficient with respect to Claim 1, which is the base claim from which the all of the remaining pending claims depend. Further, Lundin does not provide any teachings that are sufficient to overcome the deficiencies of Joy, with respect to the rejected claims, nor are any assertions to that effect made in the respective rejections. Thus, the Applicant submits that rejections I and II may be overcome for at least the reasons discussed below.

More specifically, the Applicant submits that Joy fails to meet all of the requirements that are necessary to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The

requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness are set forth in MPEP §2143, which states, in part:

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Even more specifically, the Applicant respectfully submits that Joy fails to teach or suggest, as recited in **Claim 1**, a computer having a memory storing computer-executable instructions supporting plural objects and mutation object, with the mutation object comprising:

> a method for mutating at least one object of said plural objects dynamically during run-time to provide a new implementation within the one object, wherein the one object includes a first method and a second method and an interface with a pointer, and
> wherein the method of mutating includes changing the pointer from identification of the first method to identification of the second method.

According to Claim 1, the method mutates at least one of the objects that includes a first and second method by changing a pointer within the interface of the object "from identification of the first method to identification of the second method." The Applicant maintains that Joy does not teach or suggest mutating an object as presently claimed. More particularly, Joy does not teach or suggest changing a pointer corresponding to the interface of the object <u>from an identification of a first method in the object to an identification of a second method in the object</u>.

Contrary to Claim 1, Joy does not teach the claimed object including a first method, a second method, and an interface having a pointer, as acknowledged on page 3 of the Office Action. Rather, a partial description of FIG. 2 of Joy mentions that:

> An object of object class A includes a pointer 204 to the methods for the object...The pointer 204 to the object's methods is actually an indirect pointer to the methods of the associated object class. More particularly, the method

> pointer 204 points to the Virtual Function Table (VFT) 210
> for the object's object class. Each object class has a VFT
> 210 that includes: (A) pointers 212 to each of the methods
> 214 of the object class; (B) a pointer 215 to a global lock
> method (Global Lock1) 216 for synchronizing an object to
> a thread; (C) a pointer 217 to a special Class object 218;
> and (D) a pointer 220 to an unlock method 221 for
> releasing the lock monitors. (Joy, col. 5, lines 12-24).

This description contradicts the assertion on page 3 of the Office Action that, "one of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that the virtual function table 210 is in fact the interface contains all of the pointers to each method of the object."

More particularly, even if VFT 210 is akin to the interface of Claim 1, as asserted in the rejection, Joy still fails to teach or suggest the claimed method that includes, "changing the pointer from identification of the first method to identification of the second method." Rather, the rejection highlights that the "method pointer of the object is altered to point to the object-specific VFT" but is silent with regard to "changing the pointer from identification of the first method to identification of the second method," as recited in Claim 1. That is, the pointers to the methods are static according to Joy, and thus the reference lacks any teaching that even suggests the recitation of "changing the pointer from identification of the first method to identification of the second method."

Accordingly, Joy is fundamentally deficient with regard to Claim 1 from which all of the remaining rejected claims depend. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the present rejection has not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and thus Rejection I should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Applicant respectfully submits that, at the very least, Lundin does not compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Joy, with respect to independent Claim 1 from which the remaining rejected claims depend. More particularly, Lundin does not teach or suggest, as recited in **Claim 1**, a computer having a memory storing computer-executable instructions supporting plural objects and mutation object, with the mutation object comprising:

> a method for mutating at least one object of said plural objects dynamically during run-time to provide a new implementation within the one object, wherein the one object includes a first method and a second method and an interface with a pointer, and
>
> wherein the method of mutating includes changing the pointer from identification of the first method to identification of the second method.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above regarding Rejection I, it is respectfully submitted that Rejection II should also be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The remaining references of record have been considered. It is respectfully submitted that they do not compensate for the deficiencies of Joy and Lundin, which were utilized to reject the pending claims.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early and forthright issuance of a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Dated: May 27, 2005

By: _David S. Lee_
David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222
(425) 703-8092

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052
USA

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION (Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

May 27, 2005
Date

David S. Lee
Signature

David S. Lee
Printed Name

Microsoft Corporation   11/11   Application No.: 09/282,229
Filing Date: March 31, 1999
Atty Docket No.: 116650.05